

typical, is that correct?

SENATOR HALL: That's correct.

SENATOR BROMM: And are you telling the body that the Ashford amendment, the Ashford amendment really is of no consequence?

SENATOR HALL: In my opinion, and I think Senator Ashford stated that to a certain extent, his amendment says that this law would not apply to the current contract. What it would do is go into effect and take this issue of seniority, as it relates to work location, off the table for bargaining of the new contract that would take effect December 20, 1993.

SENATOR BROMM: Okay. Thank you, Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you.

SENATOR BROMM: I spoke on this issue when it was before this body before and my problem is primarily one of the philosophical basis upon which we're acting. The...this body certainly should get involved in things that are of statewide consequence, that are a matter of state policy and the things that our Constitution, as well as the precedent that we set here, dictate that we get involved with. We face a number of decisions here in the next 12 days that we have left, not the least of which are the tremendous health care decisions, the Medicaid decisions, and I'm not...and I'm not in any way, shape or form belittling the importance of this issue and I care about what happens in Omaha and I want Senator Chambers to know that and I believe he cares about what happens in Wahoo and the rest of the state also, but I do...I do have a basic problem with us getting involved in what I call the micromanagement of the subdivisions of this state, whether it be Omaha, whether it be Wahoo, whether it be Hastings, whether it be Scottsbluff, or whether it be Touhy. I have a problem with that. I think with the negotiation coming up this fall on this issue and the mayor and the chief of police having every ability to put this issue on the table in negotiating their contract that we should let them do so. I don't know how this came about, this situation, and I guess it's irrelevant how it came about. Somebody negotiated away their position for some reason. And did they do it to save salary benefits at that time? Did they do it to avoid paying other fringe benefits? I don't know that. I don't know the history that I would need to know to come down on one side of